

to cope with its volume problems by dealing with the State Department and the Congress on a more authoritative basis.

The bill would also provide that the Service would have the authority "to establish, staff, and maintain passport agencies and Passport Service offices at such locations in the United States as the need for efficient and convenient public service may require." This authority is needed in order that the Service may establish several much-needed additional offices around the country, which have been blocked in the past by action, or lack of action, of the State Department and the House of Representatives. I cannot in good conscience continue to watch my State continue to suffer inadequate passport service in deference to the longstanding prejudice of various Government officials against the full and proper expansion of the Passport Office to meet greatly increased international travel volume.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1812

A bill to establish within the Department of State a United States Passport Service

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is established with the Department of State the United States Passport Service (hereinafter referred to as the "Service"), which shall have as its purpose the administration of the laws relating to the nationality, documentation, and protection of nationals of the United States engaged in travel outside the United States and relating to the control of travel outside the United States by such nationals.

SEC. 2. (a) The Service shall be under the control and supervision of a Director, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of State. The position of Director shall be placed in grade GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, and included within the number of positions for such grade authorized by section 5108 (a) of that title.

(b) The Director shall supervise Foreign Service officers and employees who are engaged in carrying out the laws and regulations administered by the Service.

SEC. 3. (a) There are transferred to the Director all the functions of the Secretary of State carried out through the Passport Office of the Department of State, and such office shall lapse upon such transfer.

(b) All personnel, assets, liabilities, contracts, property, and records as are determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be employed, held, or used primarily in connection with any function transferred under this Act are transferred to the Director. Any personnel not under section 5337 of title 5, United States Code, shall be transferred without reduction in classification or compensation for one year after such transfer.

(c) In order to carry out the provisions of this Act, the Director is authorized—

(1) to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations governing the operations, organization, and personnel of the Service, and the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon him by law;

(2) to appoint and fix the compensation of passport agents and such other officers and employees, and prescribe their functions and duties, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act;

(3) to establish, staff, and maintain passport agencies and passport service offices at such locations in the United States as the need for efficient and convenient public service may require;

(4) to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code;

(5) to acquire by purchase, lease, condemnation, or in any other lawful manner, any real or personal property, tangible or intangible, or any interest therein; to hold, maintain, use, and operate the same; and to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of the same at such time, in such manner, and to the extent deemed necessary or appropriate;

(6) to construct, operate, lease, and maintain buildings, facilities, and other improvements as may be necessary.

(7) to enter into contracts or other arrangements or modifications thereof, with any government, any agency or department of the United States, or with any person, firm, association, corporation, and such contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, may be entered into without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5) or any other provision of law relating to competitive bidding;

(8) to make advance, progress, and other payments which the Director deems necessary under this Act without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 52a); and

SEC. 4. (a) Passport agents and such other officers and employees as the Director designates may administer oaths, affirmations, affidavits, and depositions in connection with their official duties.

(b) Passport agencies and passport service offices established under section 3 (c) (3) shall be funded initially with money from the Passport Service Fund. If, at the end of any fiscal year, any such agency or office is determined, under regulations prescribed by the Director, not to be self-sustaining financially, such agency or office shall be closed within sixty days after such determination. Upon the closing of any agency or office, its assets shall be liquidated and the money received from such liquidation shall be paid into the fund in accordance with the provisions of section 5(c).

SEC. 5. (a) There is established within the Treasury a Passport Service Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund"), which shall include and be valued at—

(1) \$15,000,000, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act; and

(2) any unexpended balances of appropriations, the inventories and other physical assets of the Service (exclusive of buildings occupied and land) as of the date of enactment of this Act, such inventories and other physical assets to be evaluated at their fair market value.

(b) The fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation for financing the costs and expenses of operating and maintaining the Service, and any obligations, commitments, and liabilities transferred to the Service on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) All amounts received for services performed by the Service, and all other amounts received by the Service from whatever source derived, including all proceeds arising from the disposition of any property or other assets acquired or held by the Service, shall be paid into the fund. At the end of each fiscal year, any amounts in the fund in excess of the total amount authorized under subsection (a) on the date of enactment of this Act shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 6. In accordance with the provisions of existing law—

(1) there shall be prepared and submitted annually a budget program for the Service;

(2) there shall be installed and maintained in the Service an integrated system of accounting, including proper features of internal control, which will (A) assure adequate control over all assets and liabilities of the fund, (B) afford full disclosure with respect to the financial conditions and operations of the fund according to the accrual methods of accounting, and (C) supply on the basis of accounting results the date for the annual budget of the Service will respect to the last completed fiscal year. The system of accounting shall conform to principles and standards prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States so as to accomplish the purposes of this section, and shall be subject to such review by the Comptroller as may be necessary to assure its conformance with the principles and standards prescribed and its effectiveness in operation; and

(3) the financial transactions, accounts, and reports of the fund shall be audited on a periodical basis by the General Accounting Office and a copy of each report or audit shall be furnished promptly to the President and the Congress.

SEC. 7. The section numbered 1 of the Act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 750; 22 U.S.C. 214), is amended by striking out the figures "82" and "\$10" wherever they appear and by inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$3" and "\$12", respectively.

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 1814. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell, at prices which he determines to be reasonable under prevailing mortgage market conditions, direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code. Referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

DIRECT LOANS TO VETERANS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am quite disturbed by the elimination of direct loans which have been caused by budgetary restraints placed on the Veterans Administration by the Office of Management and Budget.

The direct loans are made to veterans living in rural areas where private capital for guaranteed loans is not generally available. Since the program's inception, almost \$3 billion has been loaned directly to over 300,000 veterans. During the last fiscal year, 8,500 veterans were aided by direct loans totaling over \$114 million. Recently, however, the Veterans' Administration stopped making direct loans and has been referring all applications to the private sector for placement. While it may be true that certain mortgage money may be more readily available today, there is no guarantee that this will continue or even that there presently exists sufficient capital in nonmetropolitan areas. An increase in the general demand for mortgage money may well exhaust what funds do exist. It is significant that the Veterans' Administration reports that applications for guaranteed loans have jumped 50 percent in the past 2 months.

Nevertheless, Donald Johnson, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, has recently testified before our Veterans' Affairs Committee that no veteran will go without financing if the restriction presently in force on his authority to sell direct loan paper is removed. Presently, the Administrator is restricted by section 1811(g) of title 38, United States Code, from selling direct loan paper at

less than 98 percent par. As he noted in his testimony on April 26, 1971, this is "the only paper in the Government of a similar type which has a limitation factor."

The legislation which I introduce today will vest the Administrator with discretionary authority to establish reasonable prices at which he may offer and sell direct loan paper. Of course, any sale of direct loan paper will have to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. According to Administrator Johnson, this will free approximately a half billion dollars in loan paper currently subject to limitation for the revolving fund from which direct loans are made.

The Administrator has assured the committee that no qualified veteran will be denied housing financing for the coming year if this legislation is enacted.

Mr. President, I thus introduce this legislation and urge its prompt enactment so that he may keep that promise.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1814

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1811 (g) of title 38, United States Code, be amended to read as follows:

"(g) The Administrator may sell, and shall offer for sale, to any person or entity approved for such purpose by him, any loan made under this section at a price which he determines to be reasonable under the conditions prevailing in the mortgage market when the agreement to sell the loan is made; and shall guarantee any loan thus sold subject to the same conditions, terms, and limitations which would be applicable were the loan guaranteed under sections 1810 or 1819 of this title."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) on this bill be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. President, I am pleased to join the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Hartke), Chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, in introducing legislation to assist our veterans in purchasing homes.

This legislation is something that should have the early consideration of this body. It is badly needed, particularly in many states that do not have large cities that contain readily available home loan banking institutions with a sufficient amount of funds, for mortgage purposes. Mr. President, if we are to keep our word to the young Americans who have been bearing the brunt of battle in Southeast Asia, thousands of whom have returned to take up their position in business, getting married and raising a family, we must take immediate steps to help them to find a home.

In February of this year, the Veterans Administration received 61,000—repeat, 61,000—home loan eligibility requests, the highest in any month since July, 1967, and an 86 percent increase over February, 1970.

In March of this year, veterans' requests jumped to 86,000—repeat, 86,000—the highest monthly total in ten (10) years. There is every indication that this trend will not only continue, but very likely will increase for the

simple reason that young veterans are now being released at the rate of about 82,000 per month.

Mr. President, it is certainly reassuring from a standpoint of restoring the confidence of the American people in the future of our country, in its institutions, and in its economy, to know that these thousands are returning to take up their places as heads of families, as home owners and as concerned citizens in communities all over the United States.

We all remember the dividends gained as a result of the G.I. Bill following World War II and the Korean conflict. One of its outstanding provisions made it possible for the returning veterans to get the money needed to buy a home at little or no money down, with a generous long-term mortgage.

No greater incentive can be given to assure the stability, peace and tranquility of our communities across the nation than to have these young men establish their own homes. In effect, we would be giving them the opportunity to become shareholders in America by obtaining ownership in their native land for which they fought and for which they made such great sacrifice.

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs has been assured by the Veterans Administration that early passage of this legislation will go a long way towards setting the stage for a sound economy, a decade of peace and happiness, the kind of peace and happiness that can best be achieved by a Nation of families—fathers, mothers, and children—living in their own homes.

This is a self-supporting program which will cost the Federal Treasury nothing. The record of our war veterans in paying off their mortgages is excellent. Mr. President, I urge prompt consideration and passage of this bill.

By Mr. HARRIS:

S.J. Res. 93. A joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim July 14, 1971, as "Woody Guthrie Day." Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WOODY GUTHRIE DAY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, Clifton Fadiman wrote in a book review for the New Yorker in the early 1940's that—

Some day are going to wake up to the fact that Woody Guthrie and the ten thousand songs that leap and tumble off the strings of his music box are a national possession like Yellowstone and Yosemite.

The life of Woody Guthrie was tragically cut short by Huntington's disease in 1967, but through his songs and his writings, his compassion, his love of the land, his joy in life's variety live on. Like Yellowstone and Yosemite, many of his songs are a part of our country's heritage.

"This Land Is Your Land," "So Long, It's Been Good To Know You," and "Hard Travelin'" are some of the favorites among the thousand folk songs Woody Guthrie wrote. Woody's autobiography, "Bound for Glory," written in 1943, was a best seller and prompted Orville Prescott of the New York Times to say that the book had "more triple-distilled essence of pure individual personality in it than anything in years."

Woody Guthrie obviously possessed great musical talents. Although often described as having a "wispy, raspy voice," Woody said that he had "rather sound like the ash cans of the early morning, like the cab drivers cursing at one another, like the longshoremen yelling, like

the cowhands whooping, and like the lone wolf barking."

Woody was born in my home State of Oklahoma in a small community, Okemah, located in what was once Indian territory. In Okemah, Woody was influenced by the cultural mix of three races, Indian, black, and white. The depression and the dust bowl days in Oklahoma influenced much of his earlier work, as did his move to California along with many other Oklahomans. He traveled to New York and then to the Pacific Northwest. He traveled from "California to the New York island; from the Redwood Forest to the Gulfstream waters."

He sang in boxcars, in waterfront taverns, in hobo jungles, to the upper classes in town hall, to the workingmen in Madison Square Garden, and to workers constructing power facilities on the Grand Coulee and Bonneville dams.

Woody gave up wealth for his travels, travels which brought a lot of happiness and hope for the people of this land at a time when both were greatly needed. He said:

I am out to sing songs that will prove to you that this is your world and that it has hit you pretty hard and knocked you for a dozen loops . . . no matter what color, what size you are, how you are built, I am out to sing the songs that make you take pride in yourself and in your work . . . I hate a song that makes you think you're not any good. I hate a song that makes you think you are just born to lose . . .

The significance of the work of Woody Guthrie has not gone unnoticed. In 1966, Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall awarded him the Conservation Service Award and called him a "poet of the American landscape." An electric power substation in the Pacific Northwest has been named after Woody for the 26 songs he wrote of the area while working for one of the power companies—"Roll on Columbia," "Grand Coulee Dam," and "Pastures of Plenty" being a few of the more familiar songs.

Woody has been called the "best folk ballad composer whose identity was ever known," and it has been said of him that he represented the essence of the "American spirit."

July 14, 1971, will be Woody's 59th birthday. I and other are planning a special day of recognition for Woody to be held in Oklahoma. Oklahoma can proudly claim his birthplace, but Oklahomans and all Americans can claim his music, because they are the inspiration behind the music. I, therefore, think it appropriate for all Americans to honor Woody Guthrie on July 14.

Mr. President, in recognition of the life of Woody Guthrie and the contribution he made to our country, I am introducing a joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim July 14, 1971, as "Woody Guthrie Day." I ask that it be appropriately referred.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 485

At the request of Mr. GRIFFIN, for Mr. GOLDWATER, the Senator from Alaska

(Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 485, a bill to provide that certain aliens admitted to the United States for permanent residence shall be eligible to operate amateur radio stations in the United States and to hold licenses for their stations.

S. 835

At the request of Mr. HARRIS, the Senator from New Hampshire Mr. McIntyre and the Senator from Rhode Island Mr. Pell were added as cosponsors of S. 835, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971.

S. 1084

Mr. HARRIS, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh) be added as a cosponsor of S. 1084, the Youth Participation Act of 1971. I am honored to have his name among the cosponsors, particularly in view of the decisive role which he played in obtaining the right to vote for American youth between the ages of 18 and 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hansen). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1310

At the request of Mr. Hansen, the Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Fannin), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Randolph), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Stevens) were added as cosponsors of S. 1310, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to encourage an increase in production of coal.

S. 1315

At the request of Mr. Harris, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McIntyre), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Eagleton), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Humphrey), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pell), the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Hartke), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Taft) were added as cosponsors of S. 1315, the Ocean Mammal Protection Act of 1971.

S. 1485

At the request of Mr. Ribicoff, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Hollings) were added as cosponsors of S. 1485, to establish a Department of Education.

S. 1580 THROUGH S. 1591

At the request of Mr. Percy, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Saxton) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1580, a bill to provide increased employment opportunities for middle-aged and older workers, and for other purposes; S. 1581, a bill to provide for the conduct, within the Public Health Service, of a training program of State inspectors of long-term health care facilities; S. 1582, to provide for grants for the training and retraining of nurses aides and orderlies; S. 1583, to train certain veterans to serve as medical assistants in long-term health care facilities; S. 1584, to assist in the provision of housing for the elderly; S. 1585, to provide for coverage under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act of certain drugs which are prescribed and furnished

by generic name; S. 1586, to provide for the development of more uniform standards for determining eligibility for assistance provided under Federal programs to facilities for long-term health care; S. 1587, to provide for the conduct of a study and investigation of care to individuals in long-term health care facilities; S. 1588, to provide financial assistance for senior citizens' community centers; S. 1589, to authorize grants to rehabilitate elderly patients of long-term health care facilities; S. 1590, to permit the deduction of all expenses for medical care of a taxpayer after age 65; and S. 1591, to provide certain transportation services to elderly persons.

S. 1631

At the request of Mr. McGovern, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Harris) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1631, the Emergency Transition Allowance Act of 1971.

S. 1774

At the request of Mr. Tower, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Fannin) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1774, a bill to furnish assistance to farmers in emergencies caused by natural disasters.

SENATE RESOLUTION 120—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION RELATING TO REGULATIONS ISSUED UNDER THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. President, last April 29, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare released a long overdue national nutrition survey. While I have many questions about the survey, it did at least, reconfirm the existence of widespread malnutrition among America's poor.

That same day, in which must rank among the all-time ironies of governmental actions, the Department of Agriculture announced that its new food stamp regulations were going to eliminate a minimum of 340,000 persons from the food stamp program and reduce food benefits to another 1.75 million persons.

These dual and contradictory announcements were comparable to saying that an epidemic existed but that inoculations were being discontinued.

The fact that so many needy persons were going to be hurt by the new regulations published in the Federal Register on April 16, probably would not have come to light except for a hearing by the Senate's Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

Expert witnesses at the committee's hearing first reported that such a large number of persons, amounting to about 20 percent of all those participating in the program, were going to be disadvantaged. One witness, Mr. Ronald Pollock, Director of the Food Research and Action Center, said the number of persons hurt might be as high as 4 million.

The director of the food stamp program in New York City, Mr. Arthur Schiff estimated that 500,000 to 600,000, or 50 to 60 percent, of New York's 1 million food stamp recipients would drop out of the program.

On their face, the new regulations would appear to have the following effects.

Most of the aged, blind, and disabled in 10 States, including California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Vermont, and Washington would be rendered ineligible for food stamps by reasons of new income guidelines.

Most welfare recipients in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut would receive severely reduced benefits because of the income guidelines.

Hundreds of thousands of other welfare recipients, including many aged and temporarily unemployed persons in such States as Colorado, Iowa, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nevada, South Carolina, and Texas would be prohibited from participating because of an arbitrarily low limitation of \$1,500 on outside resources.

Additional hundreds of thousands of persons would be eliminated from the program by a new definition of what constitutes a household, essentially aimed at banning hippie communes, but also knocking out any household containing a nonfamily member.

Finally, the new regulations would create an administrative nightmare by requiring welfare recipients to be individually recertified regardless of whether they have been receiving benefits previously.

Mr. President, when I first heard that the new regulations would have these effects, I was incredulous. After all the work of the past years, I could not believe we were taking such drastic steps backwards.

Whatever else may be said about the new Food Stamp Act passed by Congress last year, I think we all believed that its overall purpose was to expand participation, to help feed more people, not less.

I am aware that the Department of Agriculture believes that about 1.7 million persons, living in the poorer States, will be made newly eligible for the program by the setting of a national standard of \$4,320.

I hope this is so. But, as an editorial in the Washington Post stated so well just last Thursday:

It is fine that more of the poor in some states will now get much needed food, but what about the two to four million whose tables will now be stripped clean? What have they done to be ignored so suddenly? Is hunger and malnutrition in New York City, for example, easier on the stomach than in Sunflower County, Mississippi? If this strange decision by the Agriculture Department is a try at saving money, then it is assuredly a direct reversal of the President's intention "to put an end to hunger in America itself for all time."

The reaction to the publicity surrounding the new regulations has been swift—and distressing. Letters and telegrams have poured into the select committee. As an example, I would like to quote from one of these letters sent by an elderly lady living in California:

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: I am writing this letter with a great deal of worry and anxiety in my heart. Someone is kindly typing it for me. I am an elderly widow, diabetic, and partially blind. I reside in California and have lived here for the past eight years.

I am now on a very meager fixed income (Social Security) augmented by aid from OAS, Medicare and MediCal, and, thankfully, food stamps.

In last night's newspaper I was told there is an article indicating that interpretation of the Agriculture Department's revised food stamp legislation can eliminate the old and disabled from the program entirely. It is hard for me to see how I could go on without the extra economic aid of food stamps. Why must the elderly poor and the disabled live in a constant state of worry over their futures? My husband worked hard during his life and died prematurely of cancer. Do we have to be left to starve, or to slowly die from worry over trying to balance a budget that becomes increasingly burdensome because of rising food costs? Cannot the administration see that someday they, too, may be old and poor and ill? Are our votes really that meaningless? Please remember us and our needs.

Mr. President, because of my concern regarding the new regulations, I wrote Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin requesting a 30-day extension on the comment period. I felt this extra time, from May 17 to June 16 was vital to allow the public at large to learn about the regulations and to write the Department of Agriculture regarding them.

I received a reply from Assistant Secretary Richard Lyng last Thursday, stating that the Department was denying the request for an extension. Mr. Lyng stated, in part:

In view of the attention which has been given to the proposed regulations we believe an extension of time for comments would not significantly increase the number of people who will comment.

I must say that I disagree strongly with this viewpoint. In fact, if there is one thing of which I am sure, it is that, given more time, hundreds of more persons would comment on the regulations.

It is for this reason that I am proceeding today with the submission of this Senate resolution calling on Secretary Hardin to extend the period for comment on the regulations from May 17 to June 16.

Joining me in cosponsoring this resolution, which I now send to the desk, are Senators CRANSTON, KENNEDY, HART, MONDALE, NELSON, HOLLINGS, MAGNUSON, HARTKE, RIBICOFF, CHURCH, BAYH, HUMPHREY, PASTORE, TUNNEY, MCGEE, MUSKIE, EAGLETON, BROOKE, FULBRIGHT, RANDOLPH, GRAVEL, HARRIS, HUGHES, and WILLIAMS.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 120), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. RES. 120

Whereas, the Congress of the United States in 1970 revised the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of providing every needy American with an adequate nutritional diet; and

Whereas, the Secretary of Agriculture was given the responsibility of issuing regulations to implement the purpose of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 as so revised by the Congress; and

Whereas, the Secretary of Agriculture issued such regulations on April 16, 1971, and provided a period of only 30 days for public comment on such regulations; and

Whereas, the effect of such regulations would appear to be to eliminate at least

some 340,000 persons from the food stamp program and to reduce the food benefits under the program to another 1.7 million persons or more; and

Whereas, the aged, blind, and disabled in 10 States, including California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Vermont, and Washington would be rendered ineligible for food stamps by reason of the income guidelines under the new regulations; and

Whereas, most welfare recipients in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut would receive severely reduced benefits by reason of the income guidelines under the new regulations; and

Whereas, hundreds of thousands of other welfare recipients, including many aged and temporarily unemployed persons, in States such as Colorado, Iowa, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nevada, South Carolina, and Texas would be prohibited from participating in the program by reason of an arbitrarily low limitation of \$1,500 on outside resources; and

Whereas, for these and other reasons the new regulations appear to run counter to the avowed purpose of Congress to provide adequate nutrition to more, not fewer, persons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture should, and is hereby urged and requested to extend for a period of 30 days, from May 17, 1971, to June 16, 1971, the time within which interested persons, including Members of Congress, may submit their views and comments on the proposed food stamp regulations.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I have scheduled a hearing of the Select Committee on Nutrition for this Friday, May 14, and invited Assistant Secretary Lyng, as well as other members of the Agriculture Department to testify on the impact of the new regulations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Washington Post editorial on the new regulations and Assistant Secretary Lyng's letter denying my request for an extension of time for public comment on the regulations.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1971.

HON. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Nutrition
and Human Needs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: We acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 3 in which you express concern that we have allowed insufficient time for comment on the proposed regulations for the food stamp program.

To delay for thirty days the implementation of the new program as you suggest, would be to delay substantially increased benefits to a large number of currently ineligible families.

We are pleased to have your comments. They will be considered along with the others we are receiving. All comments postmarked before midnight May 17 will be given consideration in the regulations we adopt.

In view of the attention which has been given to the proposed regulations we believe an extension of time for comments would not significantly increase the number of people who will comment. We must, therefore, respectfully deny your request to extend the period of comment until June 17.

Sincerely,

RICHARD LYNG,
Assistant Secretary.

FOOD STAMPS AND THE HUNGRY

The intent of the 1970 Food Stamp Reform Act was to attack hunger and malnutrition by including more people in the food stamp

program and by providing more generous benefits. The regulations were hailed by President Nixon and by millions of the hungry themselves. Among its reforms, the new law replaced the uneven standards set by the states; for example, in one state, a family of four could have an income of \$4,000 and qualify for food stamps, while in another, a family earning \$2,000 could not qualify. The 1970 act pushed that aside and set one national standard—a maximum of \$4,300 for a family of four. A second feature was that the approximately 12 million citizens on welfare were automatically eligible for food stamps. Since this group had already submitted once to the ordeal of administrative paperwork, why make them and the food stamp officials go through it again to establish eligibility standards?

While this reform was far from the ideal way of getting food to the hungry and poor, it surpassed previous methods and was seen as a constructive move. Now, however, the Agriculture Department has proposed new food stamp regulations which, if given final approval by officials, will be a major source of agony to large numbers of the poor. The new regulations propose, in effect, to make more people eligible for stamps in the South and scattered states—where the eligibility requirements are now especially severe. A trouble with this is that from two to four million of the poor in industrial Northern and Western states will lose their present benefits or see them reduced.

It is fine that more of the poor in some states will now get much needed food, but what about the two to four million whose tables will now be stripped clean? What have they done to be ignored so suddenly? Is hunger and malnutrition in New York City, for example, easier on the stomach than in Sunflower County, Mississippi? If this strange decision by the Agriculture Department is a try at saving money, then it is assuredly a direct reversal of the President's stated intention "to put an end to hunger in America itself for all time."

The proposed food stamp regulations are not scheduled to go into effect until May 17. Until then, concerned citizens and their political allies in federal, state and local governments have the opportunity to protest the plan. The grossness of taking food away from people should not require long reflective thought in order to reach a decision.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, today I am cosponsoring the resolution authored by the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, Senator MCGOVERN, to extend the period for public comment on the new food stamp regulations proposed by the Department of Agriculture.

At present the food stamp program provides assistance to less than half the Nation's poor and it does so at inadequate nutrition levels. The regulations under consideration would decrease or eliminate food stamp benefits for at least 2.1 million of the 10½ million program participants, according to the Department of Agriculture's own estimate.

The national eligibility standards proposed to implement the 1970 Food Stamp Act would, among other things, virtually eliminate the food stamp program in urban States such as Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey through the imposition of unduly severe eligibility requirements.

In Connecticut, participation would drop so dramatically that it would not be worthwhile to continue the food stamp program. Over 120,000 of Connecticut's poor would face the increased likelihood